

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the November 30, 2007 final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 5, 14, 17, 22, 25, 36 and 39; and cancels 3, 16, 18, 19, 24, 26, 38, and 40. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5-14, 17, 20-22, 25, 27-36 and 39 are presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Drawings**

Applicants request that the Examiner now have the drawings as originally filed reviewed and accepted.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-12 stand rejected as anticipated by Bryan (US 7,133,869). Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection on the basis that the amended claims recite a combination of elements not taught by Bryan or the other references, either separately or taken together.

Bryan teaches methods and systems for defining and distributing information alerts include presenting a user with a series of templates that allows the user to define security events. (Abstract). Intended recipients for the alerts are presented with templates that allow the individuals to input contact and schedule information for receiving the information alerts. (Abstract). A knowledge switch uses the event definitions and the contact and schedule information to detect events and distribute the information alerts to the intended recipients when an event occurs. (Abstract). The information alerts include directives that instruct intended recipients regarding action to be taken in response to a security event. (Abstract).

**However, (1) Bryan does not disclose subscribers subscribing to categories of events and the notification template including a category such that when the event occurs subscribers of the categories are notified of events associated with that category and (2) Bryan does not disclose a template specifying a predefined schedule time for notifications to occur.**

First, with respect to categories, the Examiner asserts that column 7 line 61 - column 8, line 31 of Bryan teaches categories of events. Applicants disagree, **Bryan teaches categories of**

**recipients.** For example, column 11, lines 4-7 teach "the directory tree includes KNOWLEDGE SWITCHES™ for American Airlines, Customs, and Security and recipient groups within each category" (emphasis added). And, "the user may **select any of the KNOWLEDGE SWITCHES™ or recipients from recipients directory tree 1200**, and the selection(s) will appear in **input area 1202**" (emphasis added). (Column 11, lines 7-12). Furthermore, FIG.12, reference character 1202 undisputedly shows that the categories relate to recipients and not events.

Second, with respect to a predefined schedule for notifications, the Examiner asserts that column 9 line 26-53 of Bryan teaches a **system that detects an event each time it happens**. Also, Bryan teaches that **contacts may input a schedule** so the notification is sent to the proper device depending on the date/time. (Column 10, lines 14-32; FIG. 9). For example, a contact may specify home and work hours and list different phone numbers. (Column 10, lines 14-32; FIG. 9). However, Bryan does not teach a predefined recurring schedule of notifications for a category of events.

#### Claims 1 and 36

In contrast, claim 1 as amended recites:

receiving a parameter-driven template from a content provider, said template relating to a category specified by the content provider, said template containing one or more parameters specified by the content provider, said parameters defining a plurality of events specified by the content provider and relating to the specified category, each of said events comprising a recurring event specified by the content provider, said parameters relating to a subscription for notifications **and specifying a predefined scheduled time for the notifications to occur;**

enabling a notifications application based on the received template, said notifications application mapping the **latest recurring event of the specified category to one or more subscribers** as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider; and

executing the notifications application on a recurring basis to **generate a notification in accordance with the predefined scheduled time specified by the received parameter-driven template parameters, wherein the notification is generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category**, and wherein the generated notification is delivered to the subscribers of the specified category on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time defined by the received parameter-driven template parameters.

For example, a Category-Based Scheduled scenario template provides subscriptions to be defined in terms of **subscribing to a specific category** (or channel) of notifications to be **delivered at a predetermined time of day**. (Page 14, paragraph 39). In this instance, event feeds including the full “alert” to be sent are expected to come in for each category or channel on a recurring basis. (Page 14, paragraph 39). Notifications are generated based on **matching the latest event of a given category with the subscriptions for the same category at the predefined schedule time**. (Page 14, paragraph 39).

As explained above, Bryan does not teach **generating a notification in accordance with the predefined scheduled time specified by the received parameter-driven template parameters and the notification being generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category** as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 recites elements not found in Bryan and the rejection of the claims based on §102 should be withdrawn. Claim 36 has been similarly amended as claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2, 5-13 and 39 depend from claims 1 and 36, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reason as claims 1 and 36.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 13, 14, 16-22, 24-36 and 38-40 stand rejected as anticipated by Bryan in view of Eichstaedt (U.S. Pub. App. 2005/0027741). The Examiner generally cites Eichstaedt as teaching a CRM. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection on the basis that the amended claims recite a combination of elements not taught by Bryan or Eichstaedt, either separately or taken together.

#### Claim 14

Claim 14 as amended recites:

a user interface template configured to contain information for defining a user interface **corresponding to the application for managing the subscription of the user, said interface allowing the user to select a category**, wherein a subscription is generated for the user from the user interface template, said **subscription indicating that the user wants to receive notifications related to the selected category;**

**a scenario template** configured to contain information for defining the application, said scenario template having one or more parameters specified by the content provider and **relating to a subscription for notifications**, wherein the scenario template **includes a category component defining a plurality of events**

**specified by the content provider and relating to a category** specified by the content provider, for which the notifications are to be generated, **each of said events relating to a recurring event specified by the content provider;**

a notification generation component responsive to an event feed for **mapping a recurring event to one or more subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider and as a function of the subscription of the subscriber**, said notification generation component generating a notification for the recurring event; and

a delivery component for **routing the notification to the subscribers of the specified category related to the event.**

For example, a Category-Based Broadcast scenario template provides subscriptions to be defined in terms of subscribing to a specific category (or channel) of notifications to be delivered at a time that they occurred. (Page 15, paragraph 40). Again, event feeds including the full “alert” to be sent are expected to come in for each category on a recurring basis. (Page 15, paragraph 40). Notifications are generated based on **matching each event of a given category with the subscriptions for that category at the time the event is submitted to hosted alerts service.** (Page 15, paragraph 40).

However, none of the cited references teach or make obvious **a user interface template ... allowing the user to select a category and a delivery component for routing the notification to the subscribers of the specified category related to the event** as recited in claim 14. Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc. U.S., No. 04-1350, 4/30/07). However, in this rejection, neither the **element of user interface template ... allowing the user to select a category** nor the **result of a delivery component for routing the notification to the subscribers of the specified category related to the event** is found in the combined art. Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 17, 20 and 21 depend from claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 14.

#### Claim 22

Claim 22 as amended recites:

a computing device coupled to a data communication network and configured to receive:

**a subscription from a subscriber specifying a category for which the subscriber wants to receive notifications of events relating to the specified category;**

**a parameter-driven template** from a content provider via the data communication network, said template containing information provided by the content provider and relating to a subscription for notifications, **said template relating to a category specified by the content provider**, said template containing one or more parameters specified by the content provider, **said parameters defining a plurality of events specified by the content provider and relating to the category**, each of said events relating to a recurring event specified by the content provider, said parameters **relating to a subscription for notifications and specifying a predefined scheduled time for the notifications to occur**; and a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions to be executed on the computing device to enable a notifications application based on the template, **said notifications application mapping the recurring event to one or more subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time defined by the parameter-driven template parameters** wherein the generated notification is delivered to the subscribers of the specified categories on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time specified by the received parameter-driven template parameters.

For example, a Category-Based Scheduled scenario template provides **subscriptions to be defined in terms of subscribing to a specific category** (or channel) of notifications to be **delivered at a predetermined time of day**. (Page 14, paragraph 39). In this instance, event feeds including the full “alert” to be sent are expected to come in for each category or channel on a recurring basis. (Page 14, paragraph 39). Notifications are generated based on **matching the latest event of a given category with the subscriptions for the same category at the predefined schedule time**. (Page 14, paragraph 39).

However, none of the cited references teach or make obvious **a subscription from a subscriber specifying a category for which the subscriber wants to receive notifications of events relating to the specified category and notifications application mapping the recurring event to one or more subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time defined by the parameter-driven template parameters** as recited in claim 22. Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc. U.S., No. 04-1350, 4/30/07). However, in this rejection, neither the **element of a subscription from a subscriber specifying**

**a category for which the subscriber wants to receive notifications of events relating to the specified category nor the result of notifications application mapping the recurring event to one or more subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time defined by the parameter-driven template parameters "** is found in the combined art. Accordingly, claim 22 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 25 and 27-35 depend from claim 22 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 22.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

**Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416  
SENNIGER POWERS  
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 231-5400